REMARKS

At the outset, Applicants thank the Examiner for the thorough review and consideration of the pending application. Applicants have received and carefully reviewed the contents of the November 23, 2007 Office Action.

Claims 1, 4, 7, 12, and 14 are hereby amended. Claims 2, 3 and 13 are hereby canceled without prejudice to or disclaimer of the subject matter contained therein. No new matter has been added. Claims 1, 4-12, and 14 are currently pending, of which claims 8-11 are withdrawn from consideration. Reexamination and reconsideration of the pending claims are respectfully requested.

The Office rejects claims 1-2 and 12 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0050011 to Cho et al. (hereafter "*Cho*"). Office Action at p. 4. Claim 2 is canceled, so the rejection of claim 2 is moot. Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection.

As required in M.P.E.P. § 2131, in order to anticipate a claim under 35 U.S.C. § 102, "the reference must teach every element of the claim." *Cho* does not teach every element of claims 1 and 12, and thus, cannot anticipate these claims.

Amended claims 1 and 12 recite, "a timer for measuring a revolution time period required for said driven motor to reach a predetermined position of rotation." *Cho* fails to teach at least this element of claims 1 and 12. In fact, the Office admits that "Cho teaches the claimed invention except fails to explicitly claim a timer." *Office Action Dated June 21, 2007*, page 4, line 13.

Furthermore, amended claims 1 and 12 also recite, "determining an amount of laundry based on the voltage signal output from said pulse sensor ... and the revolution time period with respect to the reference value stored in said microcomputer." *Cho* also fails to teach at least this element of claims 1 and 12. *Cho* discloses that "a speed detector 111 receiving the position detect signal from the rotor position detector 110 and detecting therefrom a driving speed of the BLDC motor 109, a laundry amount sensor 112 receiving a speed detect signal from the speed detector 111, comparing it with a previously stored reference speed and sensing a laundry amount accordingly." *Cho*, paragraph 0051. In other word, *Cho* only discloses determining an amount of laundry based on a single factor, the speed detect signal. In contrast, the claimed

invention measures the voltage signal and the revolution time period and determines an amount of laundry based on two factors, "the voltage signal output" and "the revolution time period," as recited in claims 1 and 12.

Accordingly, claims 1 and 12 are allowable over *Cho*. Applicants, therefore, respectfully request withdrawal of the 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) rejection of claims 1-2 and 12.

The Office rejects claims 3-7 and 13-14 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over Cho. Office Action at p. 4-5. Claims 3 and 13 are canceled, accordingly the rejection of those claims is moot. Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection of claims 4-7 and 14.

As required in M.P.E.P. § 2143.03, in order to "establish *prima facie* obviousness of the claimed invention, all the limitations must be taught or suggested by the prior art." *Cho* fails to teach or suggest every element of claims 4-7 and 14, and thus, cannot render these claims obvious.

As discussed above, *Cho* fails to teach or suggest the above-recited elements of claims 1 and 12, namely, "a timer for measuring a revolution time period required for said driven motor to reach a predetermined position of rotation," and "determining an amount of laundry based on the voltage signal output from said pulse sensor ... and the revolution time period with respect to the reference value stored in said microcomputer." Claims 1 and 12 are allowable over *Cho*. Claims 4-7 and 14, which variously depend from claims 1 and 12, are also allowable for at least the same reasons as claims 1 and 12. Applicants, therefore, respectfully request withdrawal of the 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) rejection of claims 3-7 and 13-14.

The application is in condition for allowance. Early and favorable action is respectfully solicited.

If for any reason the Examiner finds the application other than in condition for allowance, the Examiner is requested to call the undersigned attorney at (202) 496-7500 to discuss the steps necessary for placing the application in condition for allowance. All correspondence should continue to be sent to the below-listed address.

If these papers are not considered timely filed by the Patent and Trademark Office, then a petition is hereby made under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136, and any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136 for any necessary extension of time, or any other fees required to complete the

filing of this response, may be charged to Deposit Account No. 50-0911. Please credit any overpayment to deposit Account No. 50-0911. A duplicate copy of this sheet is enclosed.

Dated: February 22, 2008

Respectfully submitted,

By Michael R. Aragon (Reg. No. 46,522)
for **Mark R. Kresloff**
Registration No.: 42,766
McKENNA LONG & ALDRIDGE LLP
1900 K Street, N.W.
Washington, DC 20006
(202) 496-7500
Attorneys for Applicant